

Practitioner's Docket No.: 789_127

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Yukihisa TAKEUCHI, Tsutomu NANATAKI, Iwao OHWADA and Takayoshi AKAO

Ser. No.: 10/810,078

Art Unit: 2629


Filed: March 26, 2004

Examiner: Sarvesh J. Nadkarni

Conf. No.: 3510

For: CIRCUIT ELEMENT, SIGNAL PROCESSING CIRCUIT, CONTROL DEVICE, DISPLAY DEVICE, METHOD OF DRIVING DISPLAY DEVICE, METHOD OF DRIVING CIRCUIT ELEMENT, AND METHOD OF DRIVING CONTROL DEVICE

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

CERTIFICATION OF EFS TRANSMISSION	
I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted via EFS to the Patent and Trademark Office on <i>July 31, 2007</i> .	
 Elizabeth A. VanAntwerp	

RESPONSE TO ELECTION OF SPECIES REQUIREMENT

Sir:

In response to the election of species requirement outlined in the Office Action mailed July 2, 2007, Applicants provisionally elect species 1. Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims read on the elected species and that at least independent claims 1, 12, 13, 22, 27, 41, 42 and 43 are generic to all species outlined on page 2 of the Office Action.

Applicants respectfully traverse the election requirement since it is completely contrary to U.S. PTO election practice. Specifically, an election of species requirement is proper when two or more disclosed species are mutually exclusive. In the present case, the four species outlined on page 2 of the Office Action are **not** mutually exclusive. For example, while Fig. 1 (part of the alleged species 1) illustrates a circuit element having a load


20, Fig. 30 (the alleged species 2) simply gives an example of the components that can make up the load shown in Fig. 1. As such, Figs. 1 and 30 clearly are not mutually exclusive.

Similar arguments apply to the alleged species 3 and 4, as species 3 simply relates to an application of a plurality of the circuit elements depicted in Fig. 1, and species 4 simply relates to methods of driving devices made up of a plurality of the circuit elements depicted in Fig 1.

It is abundantly clear from the foregoing that the pending election requirement is completely erroneous and should thus be withdrawn.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss this matter in more detail, he is requested to telephone Applicants' undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen P. Burr
Reg. No. 32,970

SPB/eav

BURR & BROWN
P.O. Box 7068
Syracuse, NY 13261-7068

Customer No.: 025191
Telephone: (315) 233-8300
Facsimile: (315) 233-8320